



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

6

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,357	07/21/2003	Aaron Scott Lukas	06381P USA	7231

23543 7590 12/06/2004

AIR PRODUCTS AND CHEMICALS, INC.
PATENT DEPARTMENT
7201 HAMILTON BOULEVARD
ALLENTOWN, PA 181951501

EXAMINER

BEREZNY, NEMA O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2813

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/624,357	LUKAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nema O Berezny	2813	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-29 and 32-37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 30 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07212003.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-29, drawn to a semiconductor deposition method, classified in class 438, subclass 780.
- II. Claims 30-31, drawn to a semiconductor organosilicate film, classified in class 257, subclass 40.
- III. Claims 32-37, drawn to a semiconductor organosilicate film method, classified in class 438, subclass 795.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and III, and II are related as process of making and product made.

The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product, such as a product without the required absorbance as claimed.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group II is not required for Group I or III, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Rose Morris-Oskanian on 11-29-04 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group II, claims 30-31. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1-29 and 32-37 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mandal (2002/0142585) in view of Waldfried ("Single Wafer RapidCuring"). Mandal discloses a mixture for depositing an organosilicate film comprising a dielectric constant

of 3.5 or below, the mixture comprising at least one structure-former precursor selected from the group consisting of an organosilane and an organosiloxane (p.3 para.29, 32-33) and a pore-former precursor (p.4 para.36). However, Mandal does not disclose said film exhibiting an absorbance of 200 to 400 nm wavelength. Mandal would look to one such as Waldfried for a porous low-k film because Waldfried discloses wherein at least one precursor and/or the organosilicate film exhibits an absorbance in the 200 to 400 nm wavelength range (p.226 Exp. Para.1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the absorbance of Waldfried with the mixture of Mandal. The mixture of Mandal provides improved low-k material properties, and reduced process times and process temperatures (Waldfried – Abstract) [claim 30]. Mandal also discloses a mixture for depositing an organosilicate film, the mixture comprising: from 5 to 95% by weight of a structure-former precursor selected from the group consisting of an organosilane and an organosiloxane and from 5 to 95% by weight of a pore-former precursor (p.3 para.29, 32-33; p.4 para.36; p.5 para.44-46). However, Mandal does not disclose said film or precursor exhibiting an absorbance of 200 to 400 nm wavelength. Mandal would look to one such as Waldfried for a porous low-k film because Waldfried discloses wherein at least one of the precursors and/or the organosilicate film exhibits an absorbance in the 200 to 400 nm wavelength range (p.226 Exp. Para.1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the absorbance of Waldfried with the mixture of Mandal. The mixture of Mandal provides improved low-k

material properties, and reduced process times and process temperatures (Waldfried – Abstract) [claim 31].

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nema O Berezny whose telephone number is (571) 272-1686. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead, Jr. can be reached on (571) 272-1702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NB

Nema Berezny
Nema Berezny